

● (3:20 p.m.)

INDUSTRY

STUDEBAKER COMPANY—POSSIBLE EFFECT OF GUIDE LINES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Minister of Industry and ask him whether the fact that the Studebaker Corporation joined the automobile producing death list came about in any way because of the fact that the guide lines laid down by Washington to United States corporations may have drained the Studebaker treasury.

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I think almost exactly the same question was asked—

Mr. Diefenbaker: No.

Mr. Drury:—arising probably out of the same newspaper article two days ago, and I replied then.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I want to ask the minister, is that a fact or not? The minister's reply previously was not definite. Has this been looked into?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. gentleman would consult *Hansard*, I think he would find that my words were that we have been unable to find any evidence that such was the case.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Have you tried?

Mr. Drury: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Don't be so arrogant.

[Later:]

POSSIBILITY OF RETAINING EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDEBAKER WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. William Dean Howe (Hamilton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Industry. Is he planning to meet with the executive of the U.A.W. from the Studebaker Corporation within the next few days and, if so, has he a specific proposal to make for keeping the plant in operation at Hamilton, or a proposal for an alternative use to which it may be put?

Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to meet with representatives of the labour union at any time. As I explained to the house yesterday and the day before, we are actively, but still, seeking alternative industrial uses for the Studebaker plant in Hamilton.

23033—155

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR RELATIONS

HALIFAX DOCKYARD—JOB EVALUATION WITHOUT CONSULTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence, of which I have given him notice. Has the minister received a telegram from the Halifax Dockyard Trades and Labour Council, protesting the fact that a job evaluation program is being instituted by the department without any negotiations with the employees concerned? I want to ask the minister, will he consider delaying this action in order to permit negotiation of job evaluation as coming properly within the scope of collective bargaining of government employees?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Associate Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there must be confusion here. We have this telegram.

An hon. Member: The confusion is on your side.

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): You are talking of job evaluation. I am not aware that job evaluation has been instituted in Halifax or anywhere else. What is taking place now is a review of the classification structure in the dockyard, and this is carried out by the bureau of classification revision of the Civil Service Commission. We are acting as an agent of the Civil Service Commission, as many other departments do. What we do is to transmit the information that we have gathered for the Civil Service Commission, to the Civil Service Commission. I am very willing to go deeper into this particular matter to find out about it, but I am quite sure that there is no job evaluation there. Last summer, in an interview with people responsible in the dockyard it was said that we were not considering this subject before the bargaining was instituted. Certainly as I said in my opening remarks, there must be confusion.

Mr. Douglas: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the minister if it is true that the employees have received form S.C. 3 (2265) setting forth the new classifications and pay system for service and maintenance personnel which is to come into effect on October 1, 1966. Has the government refused to negotiate this job classification?

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): I will have to take the second part of the question as notice.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask a further supplementary question.